

ORIGINAL



To: Michael Powell  
Chairman  
Federal Communications Commission

From: Eddie Edwards  
President and Chief Executive Officer  
OFS

RECEIVED

MAR 18 2003

Date: October 23, 2002

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Re: Pending Broadband Regulations

As the second largest global supplier and a leader in optical fiber, cable and component technology, OFS commends and supports the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) efforts to reform outdated U.S. telecommunications laws. OFS is profoundly affected by severely diminished broadband investment and industry uncertainty resulting from these laws.

We know that by January, the FCC expects to act on three proposals for broadband regulatory reform centered around the Non-dominance Proceeding, the UNE Triennial Review Proceeding and the Defining ILEC Internet Access Proceeding.

We're concerned that the Commission's proposed regulations fail to differentiate between new and existing broadband deployment and between broadband and non-broadband services. Instead, the Commission appears focused primarily on the organizational nature of the service provider. We believe that moving forward with the regulations without addressing this distinction will be a policy mistake that will lead to further confusion, inequity and instability in the market.

In order to increase deployment of bandwidth to consumers and increase investment in bandwidth, regulations must be designed to minimize costs and difficulties associated with all new broadband deployments regardless of the organizational nature of the service provider. This goal can best be accomplished by deregulating all new broadband deployments.

Specifically regarding the three issues currently pending before the Commission:

#### 1. Non-Dominance Proceeding

We think the proposed rule questioning whether telephone companies should be considered "dominant" in the provision of broadband services is off-target. With digital

technology, all broadband services are, by their nature, information services. Digital voice, video, and data bits are indistinguishable. This reality needs to be reflected in the new regulations.

To date, incumbent carriers' (ILEC) legacy networks have provided only marginal advantage over telecommunications service competitors (CLECs and IXCs) given that ILECs must themselves invest in new equipment and open all their broadband facilities to competitors. At the same time, Cable Television organizations (MSOs), whose deployment of broadband is deregulated, have generated true facilities-based competition. ILEC telecom incumbency has not resulted in a broadband advantage while lack of regulation has given MSOs a significant broadband lead. By investing in broadband infrastructure, MSOs have achieved about 75% market share in contrast to the 25% of the broadband market captured by telecom carriers.

Clearly, ILEC historic telecommunications dominance has not carried over into broadband dominance.

2. To what extent should ILEC competitors have the right to demand and receive unbundled "pieces" of the ILEC's network at special rates under the UNE and TELRIC pricing regulations?

ILEC's historic dominance in telecommunications services and their existing access networks has led to the deployment of dial-up modem and broadband DSL services under UNE regulations. As a result, a large and vital CLEC and ISP industry has developed which provides significant competition among DSL, voice, and dial-up internet service providers and the associated consumer benefits of provider choice. This important industry segment is dependent upon using existing unbundled ILEC network elements based on TELRIC pricing.

OFS thinks that the current UNEs and TELRIC pricing scheme should be kept in place and not modified for all non-broadband telecommunication service applications as well as all existing broadband deployments when, UNEs are already being utilized. However, since ILECs are clearly not dominant in broadband services and since existing UNE and TELRIC regulations only diminish investment in new broadband deployment, OFS supports creating a "carve out" from the status quo for all new broadband activities including converged voice, data, and video services. New broadband needs to be fully deregulated for true facilities-based competition to develop rather than just consumer choice among service providers offering similar services on similar equipment (the current telecom competitive situation with CLECs offering TELRIC-based price and provider choice).

As written, the regulations make no distinctions between new broadband and existing broadband deployment and between voice and dial-up modem telecommunications services and converged voice, video, and data broadband information services. We strongly recommend deregulation of all new broadband deployment, regardless of